

**Dover Municipal Landfill Superfund Site  
Second Consent Decree for RD/RA**

Civil Action No. 1:92-cv-406-M

**APPENDIX A-1**

**1991 ROD**

(Part 5 of 6)

1 alternatives and a very delayed and slow approach  
2 to the expenditure of this amount of money.

3 Now, it's easy, either in an academic or  
4 judicial environment, for us to fall into the trap  
5 of tearing each other's positions down. And all  
6 of us here, everybody here has an obligation to  
7 avoid doing that. Our task is to work together to  
8 forge an agreement on the most reasonable and fair  
9 response to this situation, and the city of Dover  
10 has been working very closely with the Agency in  
11 this regard and we will continue to do so. But  
12 it's important, however, for the Agency to  
13 understand that the imposition of an obligation to  
14 pay tens of millions of dollars in response to a  
15 situation which presents minimal if any risk will  
16 be destructive to the civic and industrial  
17 community of Dover. Thank you.

18 DAN COUGHLIN: Mayor Maglaras.

19 GEORGE MAGLARAS: Good evening, and  
20 welcome to our fine City one more time.

21 The City's actions, to respond along  
22 with the PRP's, has been a commendable one. We as  
23 a community over many years have been up-front and  
24 aggressive in taking a number of responsible and

1 appropriate steps to ensure the public's health  
2 and safety as it relates to the landfill.

3 Specifically, I don't want to be  
4 redundant, but the restrictive use of ground water  
5 in the area, we've installed water lines in the  
6 area for our residents. We've instituted proper  
7 zoning regulations to make everyone aware of the  
8 existence of a landfill. The installation of a  
9 trench and the vegetative cover as well, and the  
10 pursuit of other institutional controls, and we  
11 have fully cooperated with the State and Federal  
12 officials as progress has surely been made and we  
13 will continue to do . But as mayor of the city  
14 of Dover, it is the city council's official  
15 position that we stand in opposition to the EPA's  
16 Preferred Alternative, and would announce our  
17 preference for a limited action alternative which  
18 may be modified through future negotiations.

19 Given the demographics and the  
20 socioeconomic conditions of our community, to  
21 apply our limited resources to fund a 25 million  
22 dollar project of this type, given the minimal  
23 threat the landfill imposes, is at best ill-  
24 advised and morally fleeting.

1 I don't want you to misunderstand what  
2 I'm saying, because we stand ready to accept our  
3 responsibility and not bury our heads in the sand;  
4 however, given all that we face as a community and  
5 as a State and as a nation, we should be able to  
6 work together to bring about a common-sense  
7 resolution to this issue, which will surely  
8 enhance and promote our quality of life. Thank  
9 you.

10 DAN COUGHLIN: David Wright, city  
11 manager, city of Dover.

12 DAVID WRIGHT: Thank you.

13 For the record, my name is David B.  
14 Wright. I live at 203 Henrila Avenue, and since  
15 February of last year I have been the town  
16 administrator, city manager of this community.

17 I want to start off by talking about  
18 what this really means. Everett Dirkson, one of  
19 my favorite U.S. Senators said: You know, a  
20 billion here, a billion there, it adds up to real  
21 money.

22 That's just what we have here. We've  
23 got a million here, a million there, and it gets  
24 lost. The impact of that is unclear, especially

1 if you're far away and don't see how it affects  
2 the community and what 25 million means in terms  
3 of alternatives to this community. I may want to  
4 go work through some of those economics.

5 The Tolend Road landfill, SC-5, which is  
6 Source Control Preferred Alternative of the EPA  
7 and the Migration of Management option chosen by  
8 the EPA at a total cost of almost 26 million  
9 dollars, 25,954,000. If you divide it into the  
10 population of the two cities involved, Madbury and  
11 Dover, it is \$2,975 per person on a capital  
12 expenditure, not including interest, on a capital  
13 expenditure. To put that in perspective, to equal  
14 26 million dollars, you have to go back twelve  
15 years for every single capital expenditure the  
16 City has ever made. Twelve years equals 26  
17 million dollars.

18 The average household in this community  
19 pays less than 2 thousand a year, \$1997 in taxes;  
20 yet the total cost in capital for this preferred  
21 alternative is \$3000 per household in this  
22 community.

23 You can argue that, or say that that  
24 3000 isn't all coming out of the City's share,

1       it's not to be paid in taxes. But frankly, who's  
2       kidding who? This is coming out of this  
3       community. And if it's coming out of the  
4       employers of this community it's going to come out  
5       in the form of wages that they can't take. The  
6       lay-offs they're going to make, expansions they're  
7       going to put off, or even plants that they have to  
8       close. And more importantly, what the City's  
9       share is going to be is going on the taxpayers of  
10      this community. That's who is going to pay the  
11      bill.

12               I want to talk about some of what the  
13      impact is of the solution in terms of EPA's, the  
14      City's share that's now currently proposed. Now,  
15      granted, we don't believe necessarily that we're  
16      going to pay this total amount. But we don't know  
17      because we haven't got the design. And  
18      traditionally, the conceptual amount of money that  
19      we have on the table in this just-proposed remedy,  
20      when we get the design I believe that history  
21      shows has been higher. And so this is what  
22      hopefully is not a realistic cost but probably  
23      low. And so maybe our share is high, but the cost  
24      of total construction is way below. Currently the

1 share based on the formula that has been  
2 publicized that the City would pay the 63 percent,  
3 that is \$16,351,000 that the City would pay  
4 somehow, into a bond or out of the operating  
5 budget. And just to give you some ideas of what  
6 that is compared to, what that really is,  
7 \$16,275,000 is the whole City budget this year as  
8 has been proposed by me, and the city council has  
9 told me to cut it. They haven't told me how much  
10 yet, but that's clearly what's happening. Which  
11 is no where near, or not as much as your proposed  
12 alternative and our share.

13 The school budget is \$16,500,000.  
14 Madbury's town budget is only \$532,000. Dover's  
15 legal limit, how much we can bond, is only 13  
16 million dollars as opposed to 16. And you can see  
17 why this figure is frankly ludicrous for the risk  
18 to the public posed by this landfill.

19 Let's talk about what we're giving up.  
20 What things we would give up to pay for this, and  
21 how maybe they affect public health.

22 The City's share, I hope, and this is a  
23 big hope, of the present sewer treatment plan as  
24 is proposed is a \$1,600,000. For a EPA mandated

1 23 million dollar facility down the river that's  
2 at least our share. So we could do ten of those  
3 with the amount of money that you're going to  
4 require to close this landfill to protect a  
5 minimal risk.

6 A fire pumper, just on today's current  
7 business, about \$198,000. We could buy 82 fire  
8 trucks. That's more than we'd ever buy in this  
9 century and maybe two centuries. And we're having  
10 offers from -- we need two and we're having a  
11 terrible struggle to get beyond one within the  
12 operating budget and within the capital budget.  
13 That's 82 pumpers.

14 We have an iron, manganese problem in  
15 our water wells. We have numerous wells in the  
16 City, I think in the order of about seven or  
17 eight. We have one well with an iron, manganese  
18 plant in it so that people can get decent water  
19 quality. That cost us \$900,000. This particular  
20 expenditure, we could build eighteen of those and  
21 cover all our wells and any wells in the future  
22 with iron, manganese plants, this double  
23 expenditure mandated by the EPA.

24 We spend \$100,000 a year fixing



1 sidewalks up. This is 163 years worth of sidewalk  
2 repair to this community. And the City has been -  
3 - as a matter of fact was the test case. They've  
4 been held liable for anybody that falls down on  
5 the sidewalks by the court system. We have to pay  
6 if somebody gets hurt, so we have to make those  
7 kinds of expenditures.

8 And to put it in perspective, we need to  
9 build a new public works garage. The facility now  
10 is a terrible space that directly impacts the  
11 Cocheco River, frankly. It has more of an impact  
12 on the Cocheco River than probably this particular  
13 landfill does. And that cost us 3 million  
14 dollars. That's five of those to build this  
15 landfill to solve a minimal risk.

16 We need a new elementary school. We've  
17 been struggling year after year for five or six  
18 years. And I think there's some people here from  
19 the school board who will talk about this. To  
20 build an elementary school, that costs about 3  
21 million dollars. There's 4.7 elementary schools  
22 that we could pay for out of that amount of money.

23 We need a new interchange at Reed  
24 Circle. This is the State -- ours, of course, and

1 the State's share. The sum of money -- and the  
2 State's money is involved in this, because they  
3 know this is a dangerous circle and people are  
4 going to die if we don't do something on this  
5 circle. And our share's a million dollars.

6 This landfill, we could build 16 of  
7 those for the amount of money we're going to spend  
8 capping the landfill on the preferred alternative  
9 selected by the EPA.

10 For \$200 a foot, a running foot, we can  
11 get a first-class water, sewer line, road and  
12 drainage project going. We could build 81,000  
13 feet of road, almost 82,000 square feet, or 15  
14 miles of new streets for this money.

15 Some of our streets are in very poor  
16 shape and we need that money. We can spend -- we  
17 are currently in active negotiation to build a new  
18 industrial park in conjunction with private  
19 industry, where we would acquire the land and sell  
20 it to people building in this town, not the  
21 developers but the builders. The total amount of  
22 money we have available for that up to our maximum  
23 bond unit at 1 million and 3, \$1,135,000. We  
24 could build 14 industrial parks of that size,

1 which would pay for this cleanup over and over  
2 again, that we could build.

3 It cost us every time we buy a school  
4 bus \$38,000. We could buy 429 school buses.  
5 That's more than probably the whole State of New  
6 Hampshire, certainly in this area, for this kind  
7 of money. And our school bus fleet is aging. And  
8 those are school children riding it daily.

9 I guess that's why the City feels that  
10 frankly this amount of money is not only just a  
11 waste of money, it is a moral bankrupt position  
12 and I'm saying that it's taking away from more  
13 pressing public health needs and needs of the  
14 City.

15 I want to talk a little bit about the  
16 financial situation next. In the last several  
17 years the city of Dover, not unlike every other  
18 city in the State, is experiencing a downturn in  
19 the economy. This top line represents tax  
20 collections. You can see that they're going.  
21 People are not able to pay their taxes now.  
22 That's the clear bottom line. Year after year  
23 after year, the last three years, that has risen  
24 to the level of about 6 million. It has never

1        been that level historically. People cannot pay  
2        their taxes, so we don't have the wherewithal,  
3        and that drives up our costs. We have to borrow  
4        more. We don't have the interest on our money.  
5        But that's the taxes that we now have.

6                Our sum balance, which is, well, the way  
7        the world looks is called surplus, perhaps, but  
8        it's the money left over. It's our reserve. It's  
9        how much money we have to cover any contingencies  
10       on the basis of the government finance accounting,  
11       taking in these accruals is in a negative  
12       position. Because of that Moody's has dropped the  
13       City's bond rating for an A, for B double A 1,  
14       which is the same level as Massachusetts, or one  
15       step above, I'm sorry, the State of Massachusetts,  
16       which is the lowest in the country. And that's  
17       the bond rating we have to show these bonds at.  
18       That's the interest rate that's going to be set  
19       because of that bond rating to float this bond to  
20       take care of the EPA's Preferred Alternative.

21                There's some other anecdotal things that  
22        I will share with you. This is nothing I  
23        prepared. This came out of the Union Leader, the  
24        newspaper we have in this State. It's a Monday

1 business thing of this week dated today, and it  
2 talks about the level of foreclosures and the  
3 level of bankruptcies in this State. How they've  
4 reached levels never seen before. I'd like to  
5 have that entered.

6 And I checked with the Stratford County  
7 Registry of Deeds today. And we've had 186  
8 foreclosures in Stratford County, 72 in the city  
9 of Dover. That's an historical high that has  
10 never been reached since we've had records, and  
11 this is a very old county. So the ability to pay  
12 is not there, and everything we have to do we  
13 can't push on when we have to take it out of the  
14 budget and it becomes an operating cost. That's  
15 just assuming we can bond this, if we can bond  
16 this.

17 Let's go with how it affects the  
18 operating costs of the City.

19 If we were to take and float a 16  
20 million dollar bond our debt service, principal  
21 and interest, what we have to pay a bank at 7  
22 percent interest -- hopefully which will stay firm  
23 if our bond rating doesn't get any worse, because  
24 the direction of our collections or fund balance

1           hasn't improved any, it's gotten worse -- is 2  
2           million dollars, almost. \$1,962,000.

3                     What is that? That's my fire  
4           department. The entire thing is more money than  
5           we spend there.

6                     That's more money than we spend in  
7           insurance and fringe benefits for all the city  
8           employees and to cover all the insurances for the  
9           City.

10                    That's more than we spend in trash  
11           disposal.

12                    And it's more than what the school  
13           department spends to operate and provide teachers  
14           for the Horne Street School and all the staff and  
15           all associated costs, gas, heat, books,  
16           everything.

17                    It is three times the amount for the  
18           entire parks and recreation budget.

19                    It is probably five times the size of  
20           the entire planning and development of this City,  
21           including building inspection and all those  
22           departments.

23                    The total existing City debt -- we pay  
24           this now -- is 3 million dollars a year. It's

1 almost double that.

2 The total police department is only 2.5  
3 million. This is the largest department I have in  
4 the whole City.

5 Our property tax values, one dollar  
6 equals, is \$501,000. Hopefully. That may go  
7 down. It's certainly not going to increase. This  
8 may be the first year in decades where the City  
9 has not had a growth in their tax evaluation. We  
10 may have a negative growth. We may have more  
11 abatements than we will have tax increases, new  
12 evaluations coming on line. So that's hopefully  
13 the best figure we're going to get. This works  
14 out to almost \$4, just to pay for the debt. On a  
15 rate right now which is just under \$50.

16 My whole budget increase which the  
17 council is sending back to me to make a major  
18 change is proposed as \$4.40 to cover every  
19 increase that we have after I've bare-boned it.  
20 So there's no new programs. We've offered, you  
21 know, positions that we could. I still have \$4  
22 tax increases, I have no revenues. Your bonding  
23 will double, almost double that amount.

24 In terms of the total funds for the

1 City, I think this is a telling table. This is  
2 how much money since 1959 -- now, in 1959, I want  
3 to tell you a secret, I was 9 years old, in  
4 elementary school. Cheryl wasn't born. I'll tell  
5 you that Dan was, sort of. But he was probably  
6 about 7.

7 In 1959 for this year we only spent a  
8 little less than 15 million dollars for City  
9 purposes in bonds. The schools managed to do a  
10 little less than 10 million dollars. We have the  
11 water department, the sewer department and all the  
12 others. None of them can equal the Tolend Road  
13 land fill, an EPA mandate, or the waste water  
14 treatment plant was an EPA mandate. Now,  
15 everybody says you're supposed to get State  
16 funding for that, and this is supposed to be our  
17 share, not including the -- you know, there's a 23  
18 million dollar treatment plant, 5 million dollars  
19 of which is coming from you guys. The rest is  
20 coming from the State of New Hampshire. I suppose  
21 you haven't followed the budgets up here. In  
22 Boston you may not get that. They have not funded  
23 that.

24 The House budget was passed last week;



1 did not include a dime to repay us for the bonds  
2 for this item. So this is going to go on our tax  
3 rate, this mandate. We're going to pay all that,  
4 unless there's some change, and the State's in  
5 worse shape than we are, frankly.

6 If you add up every single expenditure  
7 paid for by bonds -- I think it's about 40 million  
8 going back to 1959. And I'll bet a good 6 million  
9 of that or so is for EPA mandates for other things  
10 doing with the sewer plant, sewer separation and  
11 those kinds of things. That's 40 million dollars;  
12 that's everything we've ever bonded for all those  
13 years. If you add these two projects together,  
14 the waste water treatment plant we were mandated  
15 by the EPA to do, and the Tolend Road project at  
16 the level we're thinking about that it appears  
17 we're going to have to pay, that's 40 million  
18 dollars. That equals every bond we've had since I  
19 was 9 years old.

20 I guess you can see why the City is  
21 concerned. I understand where you guys are coming  
22 from. I understand it that you're concerned about  
23 the taxpayers. The EPA, the Superfund was  
24 established by taxpayers ultimately through, they

1       paid money for oil and other, those kinds of  
2       surcharges. And they set up the Superfund and the  
3       EPA has been very cognizant of that and has acted  
4       very responsibly toward that to make sure the  
5       taxpayers are not having that money wasted. But  
6       in this case, to paraphrase my other favorite  
7       politic theorist, Pogo: We have met the taxpayers  
8       and these are them. These are your taxpayers that  
9       are paying your salary and my salary, and they're  
10      going to be paying for this closure one way or  
11      another in the wages that they can't get or in  
12      taxes. And I think that deserves the EPA's full  
13      attention on this issue. I think it deserves the  
14      EPA to look hard at the question of mixed funding  
15      for we have a lot of industries who have gone  
16      away. Because if you don't pay for it these  
17      taxpayers, your taxpayers will pay for it. And  
18      that's basically my remarks to this point and I  
19      have copies of this to enter on the record.

20               DAN COUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you.

21               Richard Houghton, Chairman, Madbury  
22      Board of Selectmen.

23               RICHARD HOUGHTON: My name is Richard  
24      Houghton. I am chairman of the Madbury Board of

1       Selectmen. Together with my fellow Selectmen,  
2       Joseph Moriarty and Bruce Hodson, both of whom are  
3       with me tonight, I speak on behalf of the 1200  
4       residents of the Town of Madbury who potentially  
5       face an enormous liability exposure threatening  
6       the economic well-being of our town.

7               For your perspective, my comments are  
8       organized to address just who Madbury is, what  
9       ties Madbury has to the Tolend landfill, and  
10      finally, how Madbury hopes that the EPA's  
11      practical and equitable use of discretion in  
12      overseeing the future remediation of the site can  
13      balance environmental and fiscal concerns, neither  
14      of which is any more important than the other to  
15      our citizens' day-to-day life.

16             At the conclusion of my statement I wish  
17      to submit my comments, supporting detail in  
18      writing to be made a part of EPA's administrative  
19      record.

20             When waste disposal operations were  
21      initiated at the Tolend landfill between 1961 and  
22      1962, the Town of Madbury had an approximate  
23      population of 556 people. The non-school portion  
24      of our Town budget then slightly exceeded \$15,000.

1 Excerpts from our Town's Master Plan evidences our  
2 town's population growth, 704 people by 1970; 987  
3 by 1980; and 1202 by 1988. Master Plan excerpts  
4 show that only one out of every four Madbury  
5 citizens has been a resident in town for more than  
6 ten years.

7 The building of single-family homes over  
8 the past three decades has caused our rural  
9 agricultural town to become in part a bedroom  
10 community, a suburb to Dover, Durham, the  
11 University of New Hampshire, Portsmouth and the  
12 Seacoast generally. Very few people work in town.  
13 Our households are made up primarily of married  
14 couples, many with children.

15 Any remediation costs to be paid by  
16 Madbury citizens will have a significant fiscal  
17 impact on every household. The Town's  
18 appropriations or budget for the calendar year  
19 1991 anticipate expenditures, excluding school  
20 costs, of only \$502,868. This is one fiftieth the  
21 cost of EPA's proposed remediation plan for the  
22 Tolend landfill site as announced by EPA in  
23 midMarch. Actual town expenditures for fiscal  
24 year 1990, excluding school costs, were \$437,131.

1                   15 percent of our local real estate  
2                   taxes funds our schools, our town's budget. An  
3                   average family household's tax bill may range from  
4                   \$3500 to \$4000. Last year's \$40.75 tax rate per  
5                   \$1000 of assessed valuation was allocated as  
6                   follows:

7                   \$31.13, or 76 percent of the total tax  
8                   rate funded the Oyster River School District, a  
9                   cooperative school district, including the towns  
10                  of Madbury, Durham and Lee.

11                  9 cents, or 1 percent of the total tax  
12                  rate funded the Madbury water district.

13                  \$3.35, or 8 percent of the total tax  
14                  rate funded Stratford County expenditures.

15                  And finally \$6.18 or 15 percent of the  
16                  total tax rate funded the 1990 town budget of  
17                  \$437,131.

18                  A proposed remediation plan costing more  
19                  than 50 times the town's current annual budget  
20                  opens eyes in Madbury. Whatever portion Madbury  
21                  must bear of a proposed 25 million dollar  
22                  remediation plan will have a direct and costly  
23                  effect on the \$6.18 portion of our current tax  
24                  rate.

1                   During the 1960s and '70s, when the  
2 Tolend landfill was in operation, Madbury's  
3 population varied between only 500 and 800 people.  
4 For so long as the Tolend site was being used  
5 there was never any general garbage collection in  
6 town resulting in waste disposal at the Tolend  
7 landfill. The majority of town residents disposed  
8 of household trash through personal incineration,  
9 trash burial and private dumps. Townspeople  
10 contributed negligible waste to the site.

11                   During the same time there were only and  
12 still only three major industries in town.

13                   The Taylor egg farm composted, burned  
14 and buried most of its waste on it's own premises.  
15 Some rotten eggs were brought to the Tolend  
16 landfill.

17                   Madbury Metals did not even open until  
18 1975.

19                   The Elliot Greenhouse is also in  
20 Madbury, but both it and its greenhouses  
21 operations use private dumps on their own  
22 property.

23                   Since 1955 New Hampshire state law has  
24 required municipalities to provide public disposal

1 facilities for either privately or publicly owned  
2 land. The language of the applicable state  
3 statute, RSA 147:23 was then, just as it is now,  
4 per RSA 149 M 13, mandatory in its requirement  
5 that a municipality provide for and assure access  
6 to a public disposal facility for garbage and  
7 other solid waste.

8 The lack of a town dump in Madbury  
9 appears to have been a problem resolved by a  
10 permitting procedure by which a limited number of  
11 Madbury residents could obtain permits to use the  
12 Tolend Road landfill. Our 1963 Town Report  
13 confirms this arrangement for the limited number  
14 of only 40 families.

15 Nothing can be confirmed about this  
16 limiting permitted use except for the 1971 payment  
17 of \$97 to the city of Dover for dump permit fees.

18 By 1972 lease arrangements were made by  
19 prior selectmen, presumably in a continued effort  
20 to fulfill state mandates and allow for continued  
21 minimal use of the site by Madbury residents. A  
22 general survey of town residents conducted in  
23 February of 1988 confirms nothing more than a  
24 diminutive non-environmentally threatening use of

1 the site my a minimal number of Madbury residents.

2 Realizing the small town that we are and  
3 the negligible use that we made of the dump, and  
4 while one can well imagine the level of concern  
5 Madbury residents have about their need and  
6 ability to contribute toward the remediation of  
7 the Tolend landfill site, municipal budgets have  
8 everything to do with the allocation of scarce  
9 financial resources among a wide variety of  
10 community needs. The Dover landfill cleanup  
11 presents a potentially greater cost than any other  
12 municipal expenditure in the town's history.

13 Madbury is environmentally conscious.  
14 As one example, the town is currently reviewing a  
15 major recodification of our zoning ordinance,  
16 doing away with more typical dimensional  
17 requirement schemes, and instead proposing zoning  
18 to encourage appropriate use of suitable soils and  
19 the protection of aquifers. However, the  
20 potential joint and several liability to pay for  
21 environment damage as a result of Federal and  
22 State statutes and regulations imposed strictly  
23 and retroactively is of great concern. While a  
24 sharing of the burden may be inevitable, it is



1 appropriate to assure that any burden shared is  
2 cost effective and one which is reasonably  
3 necessary to eliminate practical health risk while  
4 not financially crippling the town's ability to  
5 address other needs.

6 The town of Madbury joins in supporting  
7 the comments of the Dover city attorney.

8 The town of Madbury will join in the  
9 submission of professional comments addressing  
10 EPA's selected proposed plan.

11 The town of Madbury believes that the  
12 selection of a cost effective remediation, as  
13 required by federal statute and regulation,  
14 requires EPA to compare the marginal benefit and  
15 overly designed remedy will have to the  
16 communities of Madbury and Dover to the more  
17 direct benefits citizens of our municipalities  
18 will obtain by directing scarce tax dollars to  
19 other needed municipal services and household  
20 budgets.

21 Any design and implementation of a  
22 Management of Migration remedy must be deferred  
23 until the benefits of Source Control can be  
24 assessed through well monitoring.

1                   It was literally with some amazement  
2                   that my fellow Selectmen and I listened to EPA's  
3                   current assessment of risk to both the Cocheco  
4                   River and the Bellamy reservoir at EPA's public  
5                   hearing at the Dover Horne Street School on  
6                   Monday, March 25th.

7                   Much of the immediate and irreparable  
8                   harm perceived some years ago has significantly  
9                   subsided. Contaminant plumes have been controlled  
10                  and the previously perceived threat to both the  
11                  Cocheco and Bellamy reservoir has lessened  
12                  considerably. No one in Madbury would spend large  
13                  sums of money to design a school which only might  
14                  become necessary in the future. Particularly when  
15                  future needs might actually differ from present  
16                  perceived needs, thus requiring redesign of any  
17                  actually needed school.

18                  If town residents are to support and  
19                  fund even a portion of a multi-million dollar  
20                  remediation plan to the Dover Tolend landfill  
21                  site, residents will expect the same Yankee spirit  
22                  to influence discretionary decisions of the EPA.

23                  The technical comments to be submitted  
24                  on behalf of the participating PRPs should be

1 seriously and earnestly considered by the EPA.  
2 Every effort must be made to assure that cost-  
3 effective decisions are made with regard to  
4 choice, design and implementation of remedy.  
5 Federal law mandates EPA to consider cost,  
6 technology, reliability, administrative and other  
7 concerns and their relevant effects on the public  
8 health and welfare and the environment.

9 Madbury's obligations to educate its  
10 young, extend essential fire and police protection  
11 to all, care for its needy and to provide other  
12 basic municipal services are equally important  
13 provisions for the public health and welfare.  
14 Excessive remedy design, implementation costs will  
15 adversely affect the public health and welfare. A  
16 cost-effective remedy is justified, but its  
17 effects will be certain and significant to Madbury  
18 residents and the essential municipal services  
19 they demand, which together with Madbury's  
20 remediation liability exposure can only be funded  
21 by what has already become an overbearing property  
22 tax burden. Thank you. I do have a submission  
23 for you.

24 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

1 Lee Perlman, Eastern Air Devices.

2 LEE PERLMAN: My name is Lee Perlman.  
3 I'm president of Eastern Air Devices. We are a  
4 manufacturing company located in Dover. We have a  
5 150 employees, approximately 40 percent of them  
6 are residents of Dover.

7 I'm an owner of this business and I'm a  
8 taxpayer in Dover. I want to say what I have to  
9 say will be short, because much of what has  
10 already been said I want to tell you I  
11 wholeheartedly endorse and agree with in detail in  
12 terms of the selected remedy and its benefits.

13 An increment of 20 million,  
14 approximately 20 million dollars is simply not  
15 worth it. As I see the problem, there isn't an  
16 incentive on the part of the people who are  
17 deciding how much money is to be spent simply  
18 because they're spending other people's money.  
19 There's a very, very small incremental benefit you  
20 get for spending a very, very large incremental  
21 dollars that doesn't have to be spent because it  
22 can be spent later, if you follow the Dover  
23 suggestion and the problems can be eliminated. It  
24 does not have to be spent now, instantaneously.

1 The aquifer, the Bellamy can be protected and  
2 decisions can be made on an ongoing basis.

3 One last point. To show you how I feel  
4 about the sensitivity for spending money, so far  
5 well over 1 and a half million dollars -- 1 and a  
6 half million dollars has been spent by the PRPs,  
7 and probably, my guess, somewhere between a  
8 quarter of a million and another half million  
9 dollars has been spent outside of the PRPs or not  
10 counted in the PRP expenditure. So somewhere  
11 between 1 and 3 quarters and 2 million dollars  
12 have been spent so far on this so-called problem  
13 to remedy th' problem and not a single shovel of  
14 dirt has been moved. I think that's a telling  
15 fact that we're spending money capriciously. So I  
16 recommend that the presentation of the Dover  
17 managers be received carefully and implemented.  
18 Thank you.

19 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

20 Thomas Cravens, Portsmouth Water  
21 Division.

22 THOMAS CRAVENS: My name is Thomas  
23 Cravens. I'm the representative for the  
24 Portsmouth Water Division. And we certainly

1 sympathize with the residents of Dover and Madbury  
2 who have quite a cost and impact to their budget  
3 for this cleanup.

4 And I think that we are probably seeing  
5 something similar of this sort in our own landfill  
6 that we have declared as a Superfund site, the  
7 Coakley landfill. However, in the water division  
8 we have a responsibility to our water customers  
9 that we do what we can to protect their drinking  
10 water and the sources of drinking water. To that  
11 end we are also working to develop well head  
12 protection programs to protect our well areas.  
13 And we have written our letter to the EPA already  
14 stating that we support the EPA's proposed cleanup  
15 program for this Dover Superfund site. Thank you.

16 DAN COUGHLIN: Hamilton R. Krans, Jr.

17 D.I.D.A. Can you tell me what that is?

18 HAMILTON R. KRANS, JR.: Yes, I will.

19 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

20 HAMILTON R. KRANS, JR.: My name is  
21 Hamilton Krans. I live on Hamilton Street in  
22 Dover, and I represent the Dover Industrial  
23 Development Authority, which is the D.I.D.A.

24 As a former chairman and member, the

1 other members have asked me to speak against the  
2 preferred action by the EPA and for a more limited  
3 and less expensive alternative.

4 Dover is in competition with a number of  
5 communities throughout this State and throughout  
6 the Country to attract industry into this City.

7 One of the ways that we are planning on  
8 doing this and have done so in the past is to  
9 create an industrial park. As Mr. Wright has  
10 indicated, our bonding capacity now is a little  
11 over 1 million dollars. I believe he indicated  
12 that the City's bonding capacity is 13 million  
13 dollars. What we are fearful as Mr. Wright  
14 indicated, is that this preferred action will  
15 usurp all of the bonding capacity that the City  
16 has. And consequently I think that one can see  
17 the dire consequences of not being able to compete  
18 either locally or nationally for industries.

19 Consequently, I won't belabor the point,  
20 but a number of people have testified here tonight  
21 concerning the balancing of the good that the  
22 preferred plan would do with the devastating  
23 effect that it would have economically on Dover.  
24 And specifically speaking for the Dover Industrial

1 Development Authority, I can assure you that this  
2 will have a devastating effect on our ability to  
3 compete, to gain industries into this city. Thank  
4 you.

5 DAN COUGHLIN: Otis Perry.

6 OTIS PERRY: Thank you. My name is Otis  
7 Perry. I live at 137 County Farm Crossroad in  
8 Dover. I'm a member of the city council.

9 I don't have any prepared remarks and I  
10 wasn't sure about the format, so I'll speak off  
11 the cuff. But I want to emphasize very strongly  
12 my support for the idea that we're talking here  
13 not about just cleaning up the Tolend R J  
14 landfill, we're talking about an allocation of  
15 resources issue and a moral issue about how the  
16 City and the government will distribute our taxes.

17 As far as I can see from what I've read  
18 in the proposed remediation and in the FS that was  
19 shown, the situation and from what I heard you  
20 say, Mr. Coughlin, at the original public hearing,  
21 public meeting at Horne Street School, the  
22 situation at the Tolend Road landfill is not that  
23 serious. It is not the overriding public health  
24 problem that it was conceived to be seven years



1           ago when we started this process. And it seems to  
2           me that a careful, well-monitored program of  
3           watching the situation out there, fully prepared  
4           to step in and do whatever is necessary to protect  
5           the public health, if and when the public health  
6           is really threatened by the pollutants in the  
7           ground out there, is a much more preferred  
8           alternative to spending a lot of money piling dirt  
9           up on top of what is already there, with the hope  
10          that by doing that nothing at all will happen when  
11          we know that something probably will anyway.

12                 As I said originally, I think of this as  
13          an economic resource allocation issue and the ci'  
14          manager made a very eloquent statement about how  
15          we have to think about spending, allocating our  
16          resources and spending the money we have to  
17          provide the services, public health services for  
18          the people who live in this community and in our  
19          neighboring communities, and I think that  
20          spending this kind of money on this particular  
21          proposal is a waste of that money and is probably  
22          -- well, I won't say that. I just think it's a  
23          waste of money.

24                     DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

1 David Penniman.

2 DAVID PENNIMAN: I'm David Penniman, of  
3 51 Evans Road in Madbury. And I'm a member of the  
4 Oyster River Cooperative School Board, which is  
5 made up of the Towns of Madbury, Lee, and Durham.

6 As a school board member, certainly I'm  
7 charged not only to ensure the quality education  
8 of our children, but even more so in these times  
9 to use scarce fiscal resources effectively.  
10 Education of our children is naturally of prime  
11 importance. Failure to do so ransoms our future,  
12 but more importantly their future.

13 We're already strapped for school funds,  
14 as we had in our district, a major battle to  
15 reduce spending this last budget cycle, and we  
16 expect another such endeavor this next budget  
17 cycle.

18 In the town of Madbury, which is the  
19 smallest of the three towns, 76 percent as already  
20 attested to, makes up, of Madbury's tax revenue is  
21 for the schools. And with no industry in town,  
22 being a residential community, you're talking  
23 about people that own homes to produce the tax  
24 base in the town of Madbury. And such an effort

1 as you have portrayed in this particular thing is  
2 just going to kill people when it comes to trying  
3 to keep their homes.

4 Unfortunately, further monetary  
5 requirements for whatever reason again must be  
6 raised by property taxes. As you well know in  
7 this State there aren't many other ways to get  
8 more money. Property taxes seems to be the only  
9 way. Some people are trying other methods, but  
10 it's going to be a long term, if any. Residents  
11 are already at their limit regarding property  
12 taxes and are strapped just to support our  
13 schools, to say nothing about just trying to  
14 support the minimal town requirements we have in  
15 Madbury.

16 Monetary requirements on the Town of the  
17 magnitude are you proposing will break the  
18 taxpayer's backs. Many are at the limit and are  
19 barely able to hang onto their homes at this point  
20 just trying to support the taxes required today.  
21 With what you are implying, many will probably  
22 have to lose their homes. There's no way they can  
23 keep them and pay such a tax burden.

24 We ask a reasonable approach to the

1 landfill situation. I strongly support  
2 environmental protection, but we mustn't go for  
3 the silver spoon approach when a plastic spoon  
4 approach would do the job in this case. Thank you  
5 very much.

6 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

7 Gerald Daley, Dover School Department.

8 GERALD DALEY: My name is Gerald Daley.  
9 I'm the superintendent of schools here in Dover.  
10 And I'm here this evening to ask that the EPA give  
11 careful consideration to one of the less costly  
12 but viable alternatives for solving the problem at  
13 the Tolend landfill. I certainly recognize the  
14 severity of the problem, but I want to be sure  
15 that I also bring forth the severity of the  
16 school's problems.

17 We're facing severe budget crunches at  
18 this particular time, due at least in part to the  
19 new sewage treatment plant which is going on line  
20 very shortly.

21 I really fear that the impact of this  
22 particular plan, the preferred plan, will have a  
23 serious, very serious effect on our situation. We  
24 need a new elementary school in Dover. We don't

1 have it because we can't afford it.

2 We don't have a kindergarten in Dover.  
3 We can't afford it.

4 This month I sent out reduction force  
5 notices, layoffs, to 26 professional staff people,  
6 including our elementary librarians and classroom  
7 teachers on every level. There's every  
8 possibility that we can't afford them.

9 We also can't afford continuing costs,  
10 continuing hits like the one that may come to us  
11 if the preferred plan goes through.

12 The EPA has a responsibility to protect  
13 the citizenry from environmental hazards, and I  
14 respect that. I have a responsibility to educate  
15 the citizenry. I'm willing to seek less costly  
16 means to discharge my responsibility and I ask  
17 that the EPA do the same. Thank you.

18 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

19 James Richards, director of public  
20 works, Dover.

21 JAMES RICHARDS: Good evening. My name  
22 is Jim Richards, 143 Long Hill Road, Dover. I'm  
23 the director of public works and I agree with all  
24 that has been said before me.

1 First, the landfill was closed in  
2 conformance with the standards that existed in  
3 1979.

4 Second, the pollution plume appears to  
5 be lessening in size and intensity, and doesn't  
6 warrant this type of expense.

7 Third, as you've seen indicated before  
8 you tonight, the means of payment is more than the  
9 populace can afford.

10 Lastly, I've built secure, sanitary  
11 landfills that were generally lined, albeit on the  
12 bottom, with clay or membrane. The proposed  
13 barriers, all of them, vinyl, clay and membrane  
14 are excessive in their approach to protection.

15 I believe that monitoring and monitoring  
16 only should be required and hopefully a more  
17 common sense design, rather than building a  
18 pyramid of trash -- maybe even to extraction wells  
19 or hydraulic barriers or just some more thought  
20 given. The existing layer, the capping that was  
21 put on in '79 apparently is working fairly  
22 decently. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

23 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

24 Rosie Walker-Bois, president, Greater

1           Dover Chamber of Commerce.

2                   ROSIE WALKER-BOIS: Thank you.

3                   I'm the president of the Greater Dover  
4           Chamber of Commerce, and I'm a resident of Dover  
5           as well. I represent close to 500 business people  
6           in the community, most of whom live here.

7                   The words that I hear when I go out and  
8           talk with business people in the community -- I'm  
9           in the real estate business myself, and I have an  
10          opportunity to be out and about and talking with  
11          people on a daily basis. And the words that I  
12          hear them saying is: Well, we're struggling  
13          along. We're here for the long haul, but it's  
14          going to be very hard. We're working very, very  
15          hard for even fewer dollars.

16                  And this is the point that I would like  
17          you to really sincerely keep in mind. Everybody  
18          is really struggling to try to do their very best  
19          to live and work in this community, to be able to  
20          stay in this community. And a greater tax burden  
21          is going to make it increasingly difficult for  
22          them.

23                  I see the responsibility here as a two-  
24          part responsibility. It is your responsibility to

1           come up with some kind of a plan to help us, give  
2           us some ideas of how we can take care of this  
3           landfill, and that's one part of the  
4           responsibility.

5                     The other part of the responsibility is  
6           the fiscal impact on the community. And I  
7           sincerely hope that you will take that part of  
8           your responsibility as seriously as you take the  
9           part of giving us the ideas in the plan put  
10          forward to take care of the hazardous waste.  
11          Thank you.

12                    DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

13                    Jim Caliendo, tax payer.

14                    JIM CALIENDO: Good evening. My name is  
15          Jim Caliendo, and I am a taxpayer, and when I see  
16          something like this, why. I do get a little irate.

17                    You've heard from all of the illustrious  
18          people here in the city of Dover except a  
19          taxpayer. — And I'd like to ask a couple of  
20          questions. You said we could ask you some  
21          questions, so I'd like to ask you some.

22                    Number one, why, out of all the  
23          multimillion places that are more contaminated  
24          than the city of Dover that you picked the city of



1           Dover?

2                   DAN COUGHLIN: I should explain before  
3 we go on with the questions, we will take  
4 comments. We'll respond to the comments in the  
5 Responsiveness Summary as part of the Record of  
6 Decision. This is not a question and answer  
7 session right now. We'll take down all the  
8 questions and we can assure you'll be given an  
9 answer in the Responsiveness Summary.

10                  JIM CALIENDO: Well, I thought I was the  
11 last speaker so I thought I'd throw that in and  
12 give you a chance anyway.

13                  DAN COUGHLIN: Okay.

14                  JIM CALIENDO: As a taxpayer, as you've  
15 already noted, it would fall on our shoulders to  
16 pay an additional 2 or 3 thousand dollars. When I  
17 moved to Dover in 1965 I was paying \$400 a year  
18 for taxes. Now I'm paying in excess of 4000.

19                   And I do fight city hall and I do fight  
20 the school department and I do fight the public  
21 works and I do fight the fire department and I do  
22 fight the federal government.

23                   And I've seen some places in this State  
24 that need a lot more work done than the Dover

1 landfill.

2 I am also a contractor and I am well  
3 aware that given a given period of time the land  
4 seems to refurbish itself in many cases. And we  
5 do have facts right here in this City that the  
6 Dover landfill in the last 30 years has receded  
7 from becoming any more hazardous than it was  
8 originally thought to be.

9 And like a lot of farms that went to  
10 waste 200 years ago, you can walk in the woods and  
11 about the only thing you can see is some stone  
12 fences. Outside of that, the trees are there, the  
13 pines are there, and forth.

14 We don't see any dead animals out there  
15 around the Dover landfill, we don't see any dead  
16 birds out there and we don't see anything out  
17 there. We've got shrubs, you've got trees,  
18 everything else is growing out there. And I just  
19 can't see the government coming in here and asking  
20 us to spend 26 million dollars when there's really  
21 no need of it. And I'd like to have you take some  
22 real consideration on that fact. Thank you very  
23 much.

24 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you, sir.

1 Bill Dube.

2 BILL DUBE: My name is Bill Dube. I  
3 live 242 Dover Point Road. I'm chairman of the  
4 Dover Economic Commission.

5 I'd like to make my comments to let you  
6 know how this extensive cleanup will impact the  
7 economy of this City.

8 I really support a limited action plan  
9 that would reduce the cost to the city of Dover.  
10 The size of this obligation that the City would be  
11 incurring is tremendous. We've heard the city  
12 manager point out that it's as large as our school  
13 budget, as large as our total city budget. As a  
14 small businessman in the community, it's 15 to 20  
15 years total salary for our whole dealership. I  
16 just -- it's mind-boggling.

17 We need to look at the economic  
18 development, the ability to pay for this if the  
19 City is saddled with this obligation, the increase  
20 in the tax rate, the number of foreclosures, as  
21 mentioned before by other people. It's just going  
22 to create a problem that will stifle economic  
23 development. There will be no economic  
24 development. Businesses will refuse to come to

1 this City because of the tax rate. We're going to  
2 stifle all of the growth of the community and I  
3 think that we're going to wind up either  
4 bankrupting or tremendously crippling this  
5 community that we will not be able to go forward.

6 I really respect the EPA's abilities,  
7 their knowledge, but please think of us and take a  
8 limited approach that will serve all of us and not  
9 just an extensive cleanup that will serve to  
10 destroy the city rather than clean it. Thank you  
11 very much.

12 DAN COUGHLIN: Thank you, sir. Is there  
13 anybody else that would like to comment?

14 ROBERT GALLO: My name is Robert Gallo,  
15 and I'm counsel for the town of Madbury. And I  
16 just wanted to add the larger perspective to what  
17 you've heard here.

18 Assume everything you've heard is true,  
19 and then multiply that by three because of the  
20 impact on the seacoast area of New Hampshire that  
21 results from similar remedies being required at  
22 Coakley in Northhampton and at Somersworth and  
23 here in Dover. And I think a fair assessment of  
24 the amount of money that's being looked for is

1           probably in the range of about 70 million dollars.

2                     And you can't miss the fact that those  
3           are not three absolutely isolated communities.  
4           People in Dover work in the Portsmouth-Northampton  
5           area. People from Portsmouth-Northampton area  
6           come to Dover to work. The same kind of exchange  
7           has happened with Dover and Somersworth. I mean,  
8           these are interrelated communities.

9                     So once again, everything that you've  
10          heard about what will happen to Dover and Madbury  
11          is absolutely true, although unfortunately it's  
12          going to be multiplied by three by the general  
13          proportions you've made for this area. Thank you.

14                    DAN COUGHLIN: Anybody else?

15                    Okay. With that I'll close the hearing.

16                    Do I have somebody else that would like  
17          to comment?

18                    GARY SEAR: My name is Gary Sear. I'm a  
19          councillor of Ward 3. I'd just like to take a  
20          second and respond to some of the comments made  
21          tonight.

22                    You know, when we think of Switzerland  
23          we think of fine chocolate and fine watchmaking.  
24          In 1967 they had a council of watchmakers that

1 met, which they do meet every year, but in 1967  
2 there was a gentlemen who introduced an electronic  
3 watch. And in that time the council of  
4 watchmakers, who were the people that were in the  
5 know of fine watchmaking, decided that it would  
6 never work. That individual two years later sold  
7 that patent to a Japanese firm and as you know it  
8 today we have what we have, the electronic watch.  
9 Okay?

10 Now, in 1967 the Swiss had 85 percent of  
11 the watch market and today they have 20 percent of  
12 the watch market. Okay? Because they failed to  
13 listen and to with the times.

14 In 1967 I was 14 years old and I had my  
15 first cigarette. A few years after that cigarette  
16 packs came out and said it could cause, it could  
17 be hazardous to your health. I think today -- I  
18 don't smoke anymore, but they do in fact say it is  
19 hazardous to your health. Times do change and we  
20 have to be cognizant of that, but we all try to do  
21 the right thing. We stopped drinking coffee, we  
22 drink decaffeinated coffee until they tell us it's  
23 no longer good for you, and then we go back to  
24 drinking regular coffee.

1                   When I first went in the service they  
2                   told me salt tablets were great for you, so they  
3                   gave me all kinds of salt tablets. Now they say  
4                   it's bad for your blood pressure.

5                   We continue to be in a vicious cycle and  
6                   be led by government officials, and I can  
7                   perfectly appreciate where you're standing right  
8                   now because we all are there from time to time.  
9                   But the bottom line is that we are faced with a  
10                  decision that has to be made over the next several  
11                  months which could effect the future of this City  
12                  and could destroy the City if it wasn't dealt with  
13                  properly.

14                  Nobody wants to do the wrong thing here,  
15                  and we all want to do the right thing. I think  
16                  consciously we want to do that, but I think there  
17                  are alternatives and I think there have been some  
18                  presentations made tonight that show that we can  
19                  in fact do something that's positive but do it in  
20                  a way that's not going to be a detriment to the  
21                  community. And I would strongly urge you to take  
22                  those into consideration. Thank you.

23                  DAN COUGHLIN: Yes, ma'am.

24                  JANET WALL: For the record, I'm State

1 rep. Janet Wall. I live in the town of Madbury.  
2 I was not going to speak this evening, but I think  
3 I need to join the unanimous voice that you've  
4 heard here tonight that the project you're  
5 planning to implement is going to more than  
6 cripple us, it's going to cripple the next  
7 generation.

8 In our school district this year we  
9 nearly had a taxpayers' revolt. We desperately  
10 needed school funds, and yet at the same time  
11 people are crying out saying they simply cannot  
12 afford the property taxes anymore.

13 Tonight you've heard from civic leaders  
14 in the city of Dover and the town of Madbury.  
15 You've heard from businessmen. All of us are  
16 saying the same thing: We simply can't afford any  
17 more. As a State rep. I can tell you that the  
18 State of New Hampshire is hurting and hurting  
19 badly. That's not political rhetoric, that's  
20 called hard reality. There's not going to be any  
21 money coming from the State to help the cities and  
22 towns this year; we don't have it. And I think  
23 you folks from Massachusetts need to realize what  
24 we're feeling up here. We're no better off than



1           Massachusetts.

2                   As a private citizen I need to tell you,  
3           I live in a house that's been in my family since  
4           1740. Our family has been around since Madbury  
5           was part of the city of Dover, town of Dover at  
6           that time, before it became a town of its own. In  
7           the years I was growing up in the town of Madbury  
8           our family had land. Our family had an  
9           alternative means for disposing of our household  
10          waste. We had an incinerator and we had ways of  
11          burying and places to bury what we could bury. In  
12          the whole time that I have lived in the town of  
13          Madbury I believe that our family has made use or  
14          did make use of the landfill at the Tolend site  
15          approximately two years.

16                   Now, I fully believe in having  
17          responsibility for cleaning up problems that we  
18          have created over time, and I don't abhor the idea  
19          at all of picking up my share of the  
20          responsibility. But when I heard the figures  
21          tonight for what I'm going to have to probably pay  
22          as a taxpayer, I'm going to tell you that I am so  
23          crippled at this point financially that I'm quite  
24          frightened about how I'm going to hang onto my

1 house.

2 From a household that -- a family,  
3 rather, that once had large portions of land and  
4 more than once house, I live in the old family  
5 homestead on one acre of land. My taxes are in  
6 the vicinity of \$4000 a year. I have two sons,  
7 one of college age, one about to go to college. I  
8 don't know how I'm going to do it.

9 I'm doing the best I can to be fiscally  
10 responsible, and I realize that you know that the  
11 rest of the city of Dover and the town of Madbury  
12 are trying to do the same. But when you're  
13 dipping into the till for resources there comes a  
14 point when there's nothing left to take. We now  
15 have gone to the well to draw out for the school  
16 district, we've gone out to handle our major  
17 responsibilities for simply maintaining our  
18 municipalities. And we've gone to the well so  
19 often and for so much, and we've been so careful,  
20 actually, in how we've done it. But at the same  
21 time there's just nothing there to take anymore.  
22 We're at a point now where people are leaving the  
23 area because people just cannot afford to live  
24 here anymore. And I ask that you seriously

1 consider an alternative plan.

2 I'm sure that you will be very careful  
3 in choosing exactly what is best for the cleanup  
4 of that site, and I have a tremendous amount of  
5 respect for the EPA. But I also ask that you  
6 consider what a burden it's going to put on us and  
7 our children. Thank you.

8 DAN COUGHLIN: Yes, sir.

9 TOM FORBES: Hi. My name is Tom Forbes.  
10 I live at 254 Tolend Road. I'm also chairman of  
11 the Dover Planning Board. Welcome to Dover.  
12 Three brave souls.

13 I guess I'm just naive, and I was just  
14 sitting back there and I talked to a guy next to  
15 me. I said, "They don't really, they don't"  
16 really propose to mandate this on us, do they?"  
17 And no disrespect. It's just beyond me. That  
18 kind of money is just beyond me. You know, being  
19 on the planning board we work with the CIP and I  
20 have to smile about it. Because, you know, we sit  
21 there and quibble about fire trucks, but we  
22 quibble about smaller things than that. Air  
23 conditioners in the library, in the children's  
24 reading room. I mean, we bartered that thing